

CASE NO.: 50T5561.01
Serial No.: 10/666,724
April 3, 2009
Page 9

PATENT
Filed: September 19, 2003

Remarks

Support for the amendment to Claim 1 can be found in the present specification on page 8, lines 4 and 5 and lines 16-19. Claim 7 is rewritten in independent form and amended as supported on page 8, lines 6-8. Support for the amendment to independent Claim 9 can be found in the specification on page 8, lines 6-8. Support for the amendment to independent Claim 17 can be found in the specification on page 8, lines 6-8. Support for the amendment to independent Claim 24 can be found in the specification on page 8, line 12 (distinguishing control signals from encryption keys) and on page 8, line 2 (separately discussing display functions including trick play). Support for the amendment to independent Claim 31 can be found on page 9, line 14.

Obviousness Rejections

- a. Independent Claims 1, 9, and 31 and dependent Claims 2, 7, 8, 10-12, 32-34, and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, USPP 2003/0117587 in view of Chang, USPP 2002/0183003 and further in view of Nesic, USPN 6,593,895.
- b. Dependent Claims 4 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, and Rao, USPN 5,881,074.
- c. Dependent Claims 5 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, and Edenson, USPN 7,006,995.
- d. Dependent Claims 6 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, and Tehranchi, USPN 7,242,772.

1168-98.AM3

CASE NO.: 50T5561.01
Serial No.: 10/666,724
April 3, 2009
Page 10

PATENT
Filed: September 19, 2003

- e. Dependent Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, and Edenson.
- f. Dependent Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, Rao, and Tehranchi.
- g. Independent Claim 17 and dependent Claims 18, 22, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Nesic, and Yanagihara, USPN 5,712,946.
- h. Dependent Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Nesic, Edenson, and Rao.
- i. Independent Claim 24 and dependent Claims 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, Tehranchi, and Yanagihara.

Bases for Allowability

Claim 1

Claim 1 now recites that the display sends to the source signals indicating at least one display capability of the display. This limitation is not suggested in the relied-upon portions of the references nor does an allegation to the contrary appear in the Office Action. At its most relevant the Office Action, page 3 alleges that the trick play signals of Yanagihara meet the claimed "capability signals" but of course the trick play signals in Yanagihara must be sent in the direction opposite to what is now explicated in Claim 1, so regardless of the alleged "reasonableness" of construing "capability signal" to mean "trick play signal", the rejection is obviated, rendering Claim 1 patentable.

1168-98.AM3

CASE NO.: 50T5561.01
Serial No.: 10/666,724
April 3, 2009
Page 11

PATENT
Filed: September 19, 2003

Independent Claim 7

Claim 7 recites control signals indicating a reception condition at the receiver useful for establishing source transmission power level and/or a source antenna beam directivity. On page 3 the Office Action alleges that because Olson, paragraph 46 teaches remote control of a computer, and that "this means, the user via the remote has the capability of controlling what is being transmitted from the computer and projected and when this data will be transmitted. Therefore, the user can control the source antenna via the remote control."

1. No, a general teaching of remotely controlling a computer does *not* "mean" anything more than what it says. It certainly does not mean that beam control is effected when the reference nowhere mentions it.
2. Claim 7 does *not* claim "control the source antenna", it recites controlling a power level and/or beam directivity. Neither limitation appears in the references or the rejections. Claim 7 is patentable.

Independent Claim 9

Claim 9 now recites that signals are exchanged between the transmitter and receiver to define a power level used by the transmitter. This limitation has not heretofore been addressed in the Office Action nor does it appear in the relied-upon references.

Independent Claim 17

Claim 17 is patentable for reasons above *mutatis mutandis*.

Independent Claim 24

Because Claim 24 now recites that the capability signals do not include encryption keys or video display function signals including trick play mode signals, the attempt on page 3 to so broadly construe

1168-98.AM3

From:Rogitz & Assoc.

619 338 8078

04/03/2009 11:05

#527 P 012/012
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 03 2009

CASE NO.: 50T5561.01
Serial No.: 10/666,724
April 3, 2009
Page 12

PATENT
Filed: September 19, 2003

"capability signal" so as to cover something else (trick play signals), regardless of its legitimacy, is now foreclosed.

Independent Claim 31

Applicant has observed that Olson's remote control does not establish a source antenna beam control. As explained previously by Applicant, relied-upon paragraph 46 teaches only that a remote control can be used for control in general, and not for any specific type of control, much less the specific types of control set forth in Claim 31.

The examiner has responded that it is perfectly acceptable to regard "controlling the projector" using Olson's remote as being a "reasonably broad" interpretation of the claim language without explaining why. Applicant will remedy the shortfall of analysis and explain why it is not "reasonable" to regard the unspecified signals of Olson's remote as the claimed "antenna beam control". The reason is simple. Typical remotes do not control beams, much less source antenna beam form, and nothing in Olson indicates otherwise. Claim 31 as amended is patentable.

Respectfully submitted,


John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1168-98.AM3